



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion adopted except where one is necessary. All the critical work is marked also by great acumen and profound scholarship.

To discuss the commentary adequately would lead far beyond appropriate bounds for this review. The scholarship of the author is everywhere felt, and it is an unusual pleasure to read comments based on the assumption that the reader knows some Greek. Occasionally familiar passages cited as illustrations are without indication even of the author, and not a few are omitted entirely, though they must have been familiar to the editor. The parallel passages cited are remarkably full and are not confined to Greek. No one could expect them to be complete, and in a few instances examples seem to have been overlooked. For instance, on 913 *παῖδα τὸν αὐτὰς πόσιν αὐτῇ θεμένα*, there is a sound discussion of the use of reflexive with middle, but none of the examples cited is so apposite as Isae. 3. 1 *Πύρρος . . . ἐποίησατο Εὐδίων τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἐμὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*, a passage with which not all readers are likely to be familiar.

It is impossible that any two scholars should be in complete accord about everything in a work like the *Septem*, and it would be unprofitable to discuss here all the points of divergence between the editor and the reviewer. Attention, however, may be called to the treatment of two metrical questions. On 811 we read "The paroemiac verse regularly ends in $\sim \sim - \cong$ but $- - \cong$ is no less permissible (cf. Suppl. 7, Pers. 33)". To these examples add Ag. 366. On 1048 we find "We are prevented from reading *ὠλέσσατε* (Elmsl.) by the rule that an anapaest is not followed by a dactyl in the same dipody". Whether Elmsley's emendation is good or not does not matter, but the rule that the last complete foot of the paroemiac in non-melic anapaests must be an anapaest is as rigorous as the rule that an anapaest must not be followed by a dactyl in the same dipody. Cp. Ag. 358, 797, 1569, Suppl. 5.

This edition, unlike Jebb's *Sophocles*, does not contain any general treatment of the meters. Possibly this is as it should be. We are now at our zero point in knowledge of meters. Formerly we knew a great deal; after a while we shall know a great deal (and in the reviewer's opinion it will be essentially what we used to know); but at present we know nothing.

The appendices are A, Consonantizing of *v* and *i*. B, Addenda to Notes. C, The Text of the Scholia of the Medicean Ms. These appendices are not included in this review.

The printing is remarkably accurate. Very few misprints occur, none in the text having been noted by the reviewer. The conventional syllabication is ignored. This, as a rule, is no serious matter, but

in one instance it jars: on 545 the Arcadians are called *πρὸς—Ἕληνοι*.

To sum up: this edition is the result of prolonged study by one possessing profound scholarship, acute critical intuition and delicate poetic sense; and it is safe to say that for many years to come it will be the standard edition of this play.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA MILTON W. HUMPHREYS

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE CLASSICS

Six lectures delivered before the University of Oxford by Arthur J. Evans, Andrew Lang, Gilbert Murray, F. B. Jevons, J. L. Myres, W. Warde Fowler. Edited by R. R. Marett. Oxford: Clarendon Press (1908). Pp. 191. \$2.00 net.

The mere names of the authors of these papers guarantee their interest and value for all who care for the Classics. Dr. Evans's article, which is illustrated, deals with pictography and the origin of script, a subject which he will handle at greater length in his *Scripta Minoa*, shortly to be published by the Clarendon Press. Mr. Lang, in his paper on Homer and Anthropology, will have none of the expurgation theory. He is prepared to admit that "some editorial work was done for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* at Athens before the Persian War", though he rejects Dr. Verrall's hypothesis about the recension, so brilliantly set forth in the *Quarterly Review* for last July. Mr. Lang, in summing up his own position, says: "Homer sings for an audience that has lived down the ape, though the tiger has not wholly died. . . . Historic Greece was not very successful in expelling the beast from human nature. The poets of historical Greece were never so successful as Homer. I infer that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are prehistoric, the flowers of a brief age of Achaean civilization, an age when the society of princes and ladies had a taste extraordinarily pure and noble". Professor Gilbert Murray deals with anthropology in the Greek Epic tradition outside Homer, and points out that the non-Homeric material is in many cases more primitive, and especially that "a great proportion of our anthropological material is already to be found in pre-historic Crete. . . . To me it seems that there are many bridges visible from Crete to Hesiod or Eumelus, or even Pausanias; but the gulf between Crete and Homer seems, in certain places, to have no bridge". Principal Jevons's subject is Graeco-Italian Magic. Mr. Warde Fowler deals with the practice of *lustratio* in a very interesting paper, some of which has already appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*; though this, by the way, is not stated.

The longest and perhaps the most interesting and important of the papers is that by Professor Myres on Herodotus and Anthropology. To the ardent lover of Herodotus it is very delightful to have him hailed as the Father of Anthropology, and to

find his supposedly unscientific methods vindicated. Professor Myres attempts to answer the question "How far was a science of anthropology, in the sense in which we understand it, contemplated as possible in the Great Age of Greece"? He refers to Hesiod's scheme of archaeology, and remarks that his observation that primitive man was a forest-dweller, who grew no corn and subsisted on acorns, shows a reasonable interest in human origins far beyond the average of archaic or barbarian speculations. Anaximander and Archelaus of Miletus held views which "presuppose an almost Darwinian outlook on the animal kingdom, and an understanding of comparative anatomy, which hardly becomes possible again before the Renaissance". Aeschylus again, especially in the fragments of the Prometheus Solutus, gives ethnological details "of high value, both as a record of current knowledge and as an indication of the contemporary phases of theory". Herodotus advances beyond Aeschylus in his scheme of ethnology, as in the famous passage (8. 144), where the Athenians reject the proposals of Alexander of Macedon, and refuse to desert the Greek cause, for "Greece is of one blood, and of one speech, and has dwelling-places of gods in common, and sacrifices to them, and habits of similar customs". As Professor Myres says, "To this analysis, modern ethnology has little or nothing to add. . . . So far as Herodotus presents us with an ordered scheme of anthropological thought—with a science of anthropology, in fact—he is little, if at all, behind the best thought of our own days". Again, Herodotus was not handicapped by "those literary misconceptions which so long retarded the study of man in the modern world". He is prepared to grant 10,000, or even 20,000 years for the Nile to fill up the whole Red Sea (2. 11)—too short an allowance, from the point of view of modern geology, but "more than double the whole length allotted to 'geological time' within the memory of men still living".

One of the most suggestive parts of the paper is the remark that of all the data that Herodotus gives us about foreign peoples two items are more insistently recorded than the others—the marriage customs and the principal source of food. These Professor Myres connects with the question of the position of woman at Athens—a burning one already, as we can see from the discussion in the Eumenides, 'Is a man nearer akin to his father or to his mother', and of course carried further in the plays of Euripides—and with the views set forth by Hippocrates, that men's social organization as well as their physique is affected by their economic régime—ideas that have their climax in the *Republic* of Plato (on the second point, note especially the diet of the citizen, as set forth by Socrates,

Rep. 370-2, and Glaucon's comments thereon). Professor Myres concludes with an appeal to others to carry forward "an inquiry into the anthropological basis of the political doctrine of Socrates; and so to link him on this side of his thought with that great body of naturalist work, which I would gladly believe that he came not to destroy but to fulfil".

In this short review it is impossible to do justice to this very interesting paper, much of which has not been commented on at all, but perhaps enough has been quoted to show its interest and suggestiveness to students of the Classics in general, and of Herodotus in particular, "the man who stands next after Homer as exponent on a generous scale of his country's thought and life". G. M. HIRST

BARNARD COLLEGE

Herodotus VII and VIII. Edited with Introduction and Notes by C. F. Smith and A. G. Laird, of the University of Wisconsin. New York: American Book Co. (1908). Pp. 8-17 Vita and Appreciation; 18-19, Epitome; 20-81 Grammatical Summary; 83-422, Text and Notes; 423-442, Bibliography, Textual Criticism and Indices.

Shall the twentieth century college editions of the Classics serve as repositories of the scholarly professor's gleanings, or shall the student's immediate needs be the criterion as to what shall be included in the regulation Introduction, Notes and Appendix? This edition shows tendencies in both directions, with a commendable leaning, however, towards the latter alternative. Sitzler's edition is used "especially as a guide in the effort to be brief, to the point and not over-learned".

This does not mean that scholarliness is in any degree sacrificed. The syntactical introduction—an independent study of Professor Laird's made expressly for this edition—is all that could be desired. In the logical arrangement of grammatical headings, as in the painstaking completeness of its illustrative references, it compares remarkably well with Seymour's Study of Homeric Usage.

Professor Smith's historical introduction lays no claim to originality. Borrowed from Stein's *Einleitung*, it contains a helpful epitome of the nine books and an appreciative criticism of Herodotus as a historian. The Vita, however, might have been made more interesting and more pedagogically what it ought to be by the omission of the full-page discussion of the date of Herodotus's death, and by the insertion of the easier citations (especially Suidas) for the mass of foot-references.

The carefully prepared indices are praiseworthy, with their elaborate lists of Herodotean words, idioms, periphrases and notable constructions, Ionic words, poetical words and phrases.